



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Sexti Properti Opera Omnia, with a Commentary. By H. E. BUTLER, M. A., Fellow of New College, Oxford. London, Archibald Constable & Co., Ltd., 1905. 8s. 6d. net.

The editor has aimed "to provide a commentary which should take into account the more recent results of Propertian criticism and should afford English readers a somewhat fuller guide to this difficult author than has hitherto been available". The brief introduction of 15 pages treats of I., Propertius' name; II., the birthplace of Propertius; III., the Life of Propertius; IV., the MSS; V., the division of Propertius into five books (rejected by Mr. Butler); VI., Editions, etc., of Propertius. The last section is extremely disappointing. Of editions but fifteen are listed, and of other works but seven. In this meagre catalogue three dates are incorrectly given, two are omitted, and three titles are misquoted.¹ It is something of a shock, too, in view of the prospectus above cited, to be directed "for full bibliographies" to Teuffel's History of Latin (sic) Literature, Plessis' Études, and the prolegomena of Baehrens. Then comes the text, with a brief, but usually adequate apparatus criticus, occupying pp. 17-123. This is followed by the commentary, pp. 125-401, and the volume is completed by two indexes, the one of names, the other of matters, pp. 403-415.

From the fact of Mr. Butler's having collaborated with Prof. Phillimore in the preparation of the Oxford text of Propertius, (1901), one takes up the present edition expecting to find in it some defense of the many obscure readings which Prof. Phillimore, with a deference for his MSS (especially for N) unparalleled in the field of Propertian criticism, even by Rothstein, has printed in his text. But Mr. Butler has made a radical departure from the attitude evinced in that earlier recension. It would be impossible to discuss, within the limits of a review, all the passages where he characterizes the lections retained by Prof. Phillimore as "meaningless" or "impossible", and substitutes for them conjectural emendations. The following instances will serve as a sample: i. 16. 13 *gravibus . . . querelis* (Phillimore, with O), *gravius . . . querelas* (Butler after Scaliger); ii. 15. 37 *tecum* (Ph. with O), *secum* (Butler with s); iii. 11. 23 *missi* (Ph. with O), *mitti* (B. with Tyrrell); iv. 1. 36 *hac* (Ph. with O), *hinc* (B. with Postgate); iv. 4. 72 *fertur* (Ph. with O), *pectus* (B. with Hertzberg). But though here, and in many other instances, Mr. Butler has done wisely to abandon the tradition, he has occasionally departed from it, where no change was necessary, owing to a failure to understand his author's meaning. Witness iii. 9. 25 *Medorum pugnaces ire per hostes*, where *Medorum* is used in place of an adjective, cf. Columella xi. 2. 59

¹One is surprised to find Lachmann's *second* edition recorded here as being one of the "more important" texts. A somewhat careful study of the new edition has failed to reveal a single reference to this work.

ficorum arbores = fig-trees, (cited by Hoerle), but Mr. Butler follows Markland in reading *hastas*; and ii. 16. 32 *an dolor hic vitiis nescit abesse suis*, where Mr. Butler follows the inferior MSS in reading *tuis* for *suis*, though the latter lection has been vindicated by Otto (Hermes, 1888, p. 32), who takes *dolor hic* = *ego dolens*, and *vitiis* of the poet's weakness in loving Cynthia. So at ii. 17. 15, where Mr. Butler prints his own conjecture *lubet* in place of the *licet* of the MSS. Prof. Housman (Class. Rev. 1905, p. 320) has pointed out that this change is unnecessary—the word *requiescere* being used as at ii. 22. 25 *Iuppiter Alcmenae geminas requieverat Arctos*.

Mr. Butler has printed several other conjectures of his own. At i. 21. 9 sq. the MSS give: *et quaecumque* (so NAF. quicunque DV) *super dispersa invenerit ossa / montibus Etruscis, haec sciat esse mea*. Mr. Butler prints *nec* instead of *et*. Whether or not this change be regarded as an improvement, one can hardly accept the editor's interpretation: "Nor let her ever know that whatever bones she may find on the Tuscan hills are mine". A better rendering would be "Nor, whatever bones she may find scattered on the Tuscan hills, let her ever know that these bones here are mine." Thus understood the proposed reading may be defended, but, *a priori*, it would seem far more likely that both here and in v. 6 the person addressed was desired to convey, rather than to withhold, information concerning the death of Gallus. The desire for burial at his sister's hands would better accord with what we know of Roman sentiment in such matters than would the wish that his bones might never be found. I incline, therefore, to accept Prof. Postgate's emendation of v. 5 sq.,¹ leaving v. 9 as it stands above. Mr. Butler should at least have mentioned this ingenious solution of the problem.

ii. 2. 11 sq. *Mercurio Ossaeis fertur Boebeidos undis virgineum primo composuisse latus*. Here *Ossaeis* is a conjecture of Burmann; NFL read *Mercurio satis*; DV have *Mercurioque satis*; Passerat conjectures *Mercurio sacris*; and Mr. Butler proposes *Mercurio et sacris*. The *et* helps the sense (if we agree with Mr. Butler in accepting Turnebus' *Brimo* for *primo*) and, assuming that *sacris* was changed to *satis*, *et* may have been altered to *que*, metri gratia (cf. *ibid.* below), thus accounting for DV. But how was the connective lost in NFL? From these MSS we can more easily derive *Mercurio Ossaeis*. Mr. Butler objects that the distich is thus left without a connective. But if we keep *primo* (as Prof. Postgate does) and take the distich as referring, like the preceding one, to Ischomache, this difficulty vanishes, and the only objection is that we have no other source connecting Ischomache with Mercury. *Ossaeis* is appropriate enough, besides being, diplomatically, a little preferable to *Mercurio et sacris*.

iii. 6. 9 sq. The vulgate runs: *sicine eam incomptis vidisti flere capillis? / illius ex oculis multa cadebat aqua?* FLDV have

¹ Sic te servato possint gaudere parentes, / ut soror acta tuis sentiet e lacrimis.

sicut, N has *si cā*. The new edition has *sic, ut*. But, as Prof. Housman says (*ibid.*), *ut vidisti* means 'as soon as you set eyes on her'—not, as Mr. Butler would have it, 'when you beheld her (weep),' which would be *cum videres*.

At iv. 1. 65 Mr. Butler, improving upon a suggestion of Mr. O. L. Richmond's, has been more happy, and his reading will doubtless meet with a fair share of acceptance. The MSS give scandentes quasvis (so FL; NDV having quisquis) cernit (cernet F) de vallibus arces / ingenio muros aestimet ille meo. Mr. Richmond, observing that *quasvis* could hardly be explained as a corruption of *quisquis*, proposed scandentesque Asis cernit qui vallibus arces. The editor's contribution consists in the substitution of *qui* for *que*, which enables him to retain the *de* of the MSS. *quisquis* will then be explained as an attempt at correcting the meaningless *quasvis*.

Lastly, at iv. 11. 53 the editor reads *cui, iuratos* for *cuius rasos* of the MSS. But *iuratos ignes* can scarcely mean, as Mr. Butler thinks, 'the sacred fires which she had sworn to keep.'

In his treatment of the problem of transpositions Mr. Butler manifests a wise conservatism. While frankly admitting that transposition is probably the true remedy for obscurity in the sequence of the thought in not a few passages, he yet finds it a "serious and almost unanswerable objection" to the copious employment of such methods, that it is extremely hard to frame any reasonable hypothesis to account for the wholesale mutilation of the text thus assumed (see p. 13). Accordingly, while ready to discuss such proposed transpositions in his notes, where he often confesses the improvement thus brought about, he seldom ventures upon the alteration in his text. In some few places, however, the displacement is so slight and the gain so obvious that the change is made, as being practically a certain correction. Thus in i. 15, vv. 15 sq. are placed after v. 20; in ii. 30, vv. 19–22 are placed at the beginning; in ii. 31, vv. 5–8 are postponed to the end; in iii. 7, vv. 21–24 are inserted between vv. 38 and 39; in iii. 9, vv. 51 and 49 are made to exchange places; in iii. 11, vv. 57 sq. are printed after v. 46 (the editor's own conjecture); and similar slight changes are made in a few other places.

In ii. 6 Mr. Butler suggests a transposition but refrains from printing it, candidly confessing that "it is not necessary for the present passage and is incapable of proof." His readers will perhaps go farther and pronounce it capable of disproof. Propertius is here drawing upon his mythological lore for parallels to the infidelity of Cynthia. Lines 15 sqq. run thus: his olim ut fama est vitiis ad proelia ventum est, / his Troiana vides funera principiis; / aspera Centauros eadem dementia iussit / frangere in adversum pocula Pirithoum. Mr. Butler thinks it "not improbable" that we should insert between 16 and 17 a distich from another elegy (iii. 18. 29 sq.), hic olim ignaros luctus populavit Achivos, / Atridae magno cum stetit alter amor, which he renders :

"such sorrow once afflicted the Achivi, when Atrides' new passion cost them so dear." But there is here no question of mourning (the proper meaning of *luctus*) and, moreover, the words *hic luctus*, commencing a line which comes immediately after lines beginning, respectively, with *his . . . vitiis* (i. e. such infidelity as Cynthia's) and *his . . . principiis* ('such beginnings as have led up to my own misery') are unintelligible, unless they, too, refer back to the infidelity against which the poet is protesting. But, instead of this, they must be understood of the *result* of such infidelity. The reader then is led on by the striking anaphora in *his . . . his . . . hic*, only to find, when he comes to the end of the sentence, that a highly rhetorical device has been employed not to emphasize the author's meaning, but to befuddle it.

But there is another cure for obstinate cases of disjunctiveness which Mr. Butler has employed more boldly. This is a redivision of poems. Here the MSS are no very certain guides, and an editor who chooses to disregard their indications, where the sense appears to demand it, may justly claim to be doing the tradition no great violence. Whether such corrections are in fact any more susceptible of proof than are transpositions, may perhaps be doubted. At all events the errors they imply are more easily accounted for, and they possess this unquestionable advantage, that the reader may readily disregard them, if he see fit, which is more than can be said for the transpositions. Mr. Butler, acting upon a suggestion of Lipsius, divides i. 8, making a new elegy begin with v. 27 *Hic erat! hic iurata manet!* Other poems thus divided are ii. 13; ii. 18; ii. 22; ii. 24; ii. 26; ii. 28; ii. 29; iii. 8; and iv. 1. The only such change original with him is in ii. 8, / where a new poem is made to commence with v. 13—not a convincing innovation, as it seems to the present reviewer.

Turning now to the commentary, I will discuss a few passages where I find myself unable to accept the editor's conclusions. And, first, i. 13, 35 sq. *quae tibi sit felix, quoniam novus incidit error; / et quodcumque voles, una sit ista tibi.* With this friendly wish Propertius concludes a generous panegyric upon the mistress of his friend Gallus. It seems to mean, not 'may she, and nobody else, bring you whatsoever you desire', but 'may she, in her one person, bring you all conceivable joys'. See Prof. Postgate's suggestive note on "A Propertian use of unus" in the *Journal of Philology*, vol. 21, pp. 66 sqq. Mr. Butler misses the peculiar charm which *una* lends the line, and rendering it "may she and she alone be all your heart's desire" rejects the *quodcumque* of the vulgate in favor of Fruter's grotesque *quotcumque*. "'and, however, widely your desires may range, may she alone be thine". That is, 'however many women you may love, may you succeed with none but her'! There is a further consideration which confirms me in my belief that *quodcumque voles* is what P. wrote. At i. 15. 32 we read *sis quodcumque voles, non aliena*

tamen, and Prof. Postgate has shown how P. will repeat a phrase, often when, as here, the new context lends it quite a new meaning.

ii. 1. 47 laus in amore mori, laus altera si datur uno / posse frui: fruar o solus amore meo! Mr. Butler comments: "*uno* O sc. *amore*. The sense is excellent. 'Yet further glory to enjoy but one love only (cf. ii. 13a. 36 unius hic quondam servus amoris erat), and may I never have a rival in my love!'" Observe that Mr. Butler ignores the word *posse*. Supplying this omission we get: 'yet further glory to be able to enjoy but one love only'—surely a singular glory, and by no means illustrated by the citation from ii. 13a. *uno* is best regarded as a dative.

ii. 7. 15 sq. quod si vera meae comitarem castra puellae, / non mihi sat magnus Castoris iret equus. "The sense is 'If I were to follow the camp, that is the only true camp for me, where my mistress commands, the war horse of Castor would not be spirited enough for me'. *Castra vera* are the *castra amoris*". But P. is following the *castra amoris*, and always *has*. Why then 'If I *were* to follow'? And to make him say 'If love were my warfare not even Cyllarus would be a good enough horse for me' is yet more absurd. How is a horse to be used in love's campaign? P. means si castra meae puellae comitans comitarem castra vera, etc.

In constituting his text at ii. 9. 17, Mr. Butler is guilty of a fallacy. NF give us tunc igitur viris gaudebat Graecia natis. For *viris* DV give *castis*; the Itali correct to *veris*. Mr. Butler accepts *veris*, as being indicated by the *viris* of NF, explaining away *castis* as a gloss on *veris*. But if the scribe had had before him the reading *veris . . . natis*, which could hardly mean anything but 'true-born children,' as Mr. Butler tells us it does, where could he have hit upon the idea that *veris* meant *castis*? The gloss theory of the origin of the reading *castis* is based upon the assumption that Baehrens was right in conjecturing that the archetype read *nuptis*. 'True brides' would mean, as the scribe in question saw, 'brides true to their husbands', hence the gloss *castis*; but *veris natis* could hardly be understood by even the most imaginative of copyists to signify 'children true to their marriage vows'.

ii. 33. 21 sq. at tu, quae nostro nimium placata dolore es, / noctibus his vacui ter faciamus iter. P. is vexed by Cynthia's observance of the period of continence enjoined, at fixed times, upon the votaries of Isis. He has been bitterly inveighing against the goddess and her cult, and, with the words quoted, turns to Cynthia, in the hope that his remonstrance may have overcome her obduracy. They may be translated (taking *nimium*, as Hertzberg suggests, with *dolore*) 'But thou, who art softened by my too great anguish,—free from these nights let us thrice make love's journey'. Mr. Butler comments: "Two interpretations are possible. (1) *noctibus his* = in the nights that now are ours; the nights subsequent to the *decem noctes* of v. 2. *vacui* = free

from care, light hearted. (2) *noctibus his* are to be identified with the *decem noctes*: 'let us who have been idle during these nights thrice make love's journey'. Against (1) may be urged that *noctibus his* cannot naturally be referred to any but the *decem noctes* of v. 2., which were the occasion of the poem, and that *ter* is absurd if *noctibus his* be understood of an indefinite 'time within which'; against both (1) and (2) that the ten nights were not yet past. Cf. v. 1 sq. *Tristia iam redeunt iterum sollemnia nobis*: / *Cynthia iam noctes est operata decem*, with the note of Rothstein ad loc., and Prof. Postgate's on Tib. ii. i. 9, where it is held that 'the best Latin writers appear to use *operatus* only of present time'. The phrase in question can have here but one meaning—*noctium harum religione vacui* 'free from observance of these nights'.

iv. 8. 47 sq. *cantabant surdo, nudabant pectora caeco*: / *Lanuvii ad portas, ei mihi, solus eram*. P. is giving a little dinner to two ladies of undoubted affability, in the endeavor to solace himself for his desertion by Cynthia, who has driven off to Lanuvium, in company with his rival. His fair guests are doing their best to engage his admiration, by all the arts at their command, but all in vain. 'I was deaf to their singing and blind to their charming, for, alas! I stood alone [tho' to outward seeming here in Rome, and abundantly provided with companions] by Lanuvium's gates'. What could better express the poet's pre-occupied state of mind? Yet Mr. Butler tells us, and an able scholar has commended his sagacity in making the observation, that "*totus* (Cuypers) is a necessary correction for *solus*. *Solus eram* could only mean 'I was alone (solitary) at Lanuvium'. It could not mean 'I was at Lanuvium, and Lanuvium only.' For that we should require *solum*"!

iv. 9. 5 sqq. *Amphytrioniades qua tempestate invencos / egerat a stabulis, o Erythea, tuis, / venit ad invictos pecorosa Palatia montes, / et statuit fessos, fessus et ipse, boves, / qua Velabra suo stagnabant flumina quaque / nauta per urbanas velificabat aquas*. Mr. Butler follows O, reading *quoque* in preference to the vulgate *quaque*. But may one say 'A. halted his cattle *whither* the sailor cruised'?

It is perhaps truer of Propertius than of any other Latin poet that every reader must be his own editor, for there is here no hard and fast line of demarcation between the defensible and the indefensible. Where the MSS are so untrustworthy there can be no consensus of opinion as to what is or is not Propertian usage. It is, therefore, inevitable that every one who uses this book should take issue more or less often with the judgment of the editor. But his work will be, none the less, a convenient and useful auxiliary to Propertian study, for Mr. Butler is always a candid critic, and has found space in his admirably clear and compact notes for the presentation of such suggestions as seem to him worthy of consideration, even though he may himself reject

them. Thus his commentary forms a sort of compendium of recent, especially English, Propertian criticism, such as is extant nowhere else.

Externally the new edition is comely and attractive. The print is rather small, but very clear. Paper and binding are well chosen. It is perhaps questionable taste to employ uncut edges for a manual intended for ready cross-reference, and the reader would have been grateful had the number of the elegy, as well as that of the book, been printed at the top of the page, in the commentary. The misprints are not more numerous than was to be expected in the first impression of so large a book. On p. 24 e. g. the numbers of the lines have got misplaced; on p. 34 v. 33 *Pege*, and not *Pegae*, should be read (cf. the comment); on p. 208 (note on v. 15) 'casual' should be 'causal'; on p. 211 (note on v. 22) *comminus* is four times misspelt *cominus*. Some errors there are, hardly to be laid at the door of the scapegoat printer. On i. 3. 16 we read "He passes one arm beneath her neck with a gentle caress". This is what '*Amor*' and '*Liber*' bade him do, but he tells us himself, and we are bound to believe him rather than Mr. Butler, that he did not dare to do it. An amusing slip is made at ii. 34. 91, where Prof. Postgate is taken to task for a reading of which an inspection of that gentleman's edition proves him innocent. Upon ii. 4. 19 sq. *tranquillo tuta descendis flumine cumba: / quid tibi tam parvi litoris unda nocet?* Mr. Butler gravely argues that *litus* means the bank of a river. "The epithet *tam parvi* precludes any reference to the sea, and *descendis* points to a river". So, perhaps, does *flumine*!

STANFORD UNIVERSITY.

B. O. FOSTER.